

## ATTACHMENT - REMARKS

By this Amendment, the claims have been amended for allowance as noted with particularity below. It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

Initially in the **Allowable Subject Matter** section of the outstanding DETAILED ACTION, it was indicated that independent claim 2 and claims 3-4 dependent therefrom were allowed. This indication of allowance is appreciated. By this Amendment, claims 2-4 have only been amended to remove the element identifying letters and numerals from the claims as preferred for US practice. Thus, these claims are substantively unchanged, and hence remain allowed.

In the following **Claim Objections** section, dependent claims 9-14 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. This indication of allowable subject matter is likewise appreciated. In accordance therewith, allowable dependent claim 9 (now canceled) has been rewritten in independent form by moving the subject matter thereof into base/independent claim 8 from which claim 9 immediately depended. In addition, claim 8 has also been revised as shown to better recite the steps of the method; and claims 10-14 have been amended consistent with the changes to independent claim 8. Therefore, independent claim 8 and dependent claims 10-14 should now be in condition for allowance.

In the **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112** section, independent claim 5 (and dependent claims 6-7 for the same reasons) were rejected as being indefinite due to the use of "e.g." (meaning "for example"). By this Amendment, claim 5 has been revised to delete the use of "e.g.", and overall to better define the elements thereof in accordance

with preferred US practice. In addition, it will be noted that the "such as" phrase has also been deleted, with the preferred "concrete" casting compound now recited in new dependent claim 16. In view of these changes, it is submitted that independent claim 5 and dependent claim 7 (claim 6 being now deleted as noted below) are now definite.

In the ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*** section, independent claims 1 and 8 were rejected as being obvious over the principal Roy patent in view of the Kiuchi patent. However, claim 1 has now been canceled; and claim 8 now includes the allowable subject matter of claim 9. Therefore, with respect to claim 1, this rejection is no longer applicable; and with respect to claim 8, this rejection has been overcome.


In the ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*** section, independent claim 5 was rejected as being anticipated by the Roy patent. However, it will be noted that claims 6 and 7 dependent from independent claim 5 were not rejected over any art. Therefore, independent claim 5 has now been revised to include the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 6 (now canceled), making both independent claim 5 and claim 7 dependent therefrom allowable.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 7, 2008

Signed By  
Attorney of Record



Name: Douglas E. Jackson  
Registration No.: 28,518

**STITES & HARBISON PLLC** ♦ 1199 North Fairfax St. ♦ Suite 900 ♦ Alexandria, VA 22314  
TEL: 703-739-4900 ♦ FAX: 703-739-9577 ♦ CUSTOMER NO. 881